

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit	: 2433	Customer No. 035811
Examiner	: Michael D. Anderson	
Serial No.	: 10/501,858	Docket No.: LMC-04-1175
Filed	: October 25, 2004	
Inventor	: Daniel Lecomte	Confirmation No.: 6398
Title	: DEVICE FOR SECURE : TRANSMISSION RECORDING : AND VISUALIZATION OF : AUDIOVISUAL PROGRAMS	
		Dated: July 24, 2012

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Official Action dated April 10, 2012.

Claims 68 to 79 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Ando, in view of Li and Tahara. The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited publications.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Ando, Li and Tahara fail to teach or suggest a “modified Prediction coded image being a randomly generated image or the result of swapping two Prediction coded images, so that the modification from said at least one Prediction coded image results in a visually altered video sequence” as recited in Claims 69 and 78. As conceded by the rejection, Ando fails to teach or suggest a modified Prediction coded image being a randomly generated image or the result of swapping two Prediction coded images. Li fails to cure this deficiency.

Li’s static region detection and duplication procedure, which is cited in the rejection, does not teach, disclose or suggest the analysis of a coded stream recited in Claims 69 and 78. For example, Li discloses that the static region detection and duplication procedure is directed at eliminating the “flickering effect” from pixels that have changed in value due to a change in lighting conditions rather than movement. Indeed, Li provides that the Laplacians of corresponding pixels of two frames are compared to identify absolute differences and differentiate between regions associated with motion and those associated with lighting